



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,029	06/27/2003	Chang Wook Han	049128-5111	5609

9629 7590 03/22/2007  
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER
----------

QUINTO, KEVIN V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2826

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/607,029	HAN, CHANG WOOK	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kevin Quinto	2826	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-27 and 33-36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 28, 30 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 29 and 31 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2006 with regard to claims 14 and 28-32 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant states on p. 4 of the response, that the rejection utilizing the Yamazaki (United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0027369 A1) fails to disclose an organic electro luminescence diode (OLED) formed on the low refractive thin film and states that the meaning of the word "on" is irrelevant with respect to claims 14 and 28. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner pointed out that the use of the word "on" by itself does not necessarily mean *direct contact between two objects or layers* in the semiconductor art. The word "on" by itself could mean that there may possibly be one or several layers between the two objects or layers to which the word "on" is referring. As stated in the previous Office action, the applicant appears to interpret the word "on" in the same manner since previously amended claims 1, 4, and 15 (filed on June 27, 2006) specifically use the phrase "directly on" to *differentiate from the broader meaning* of "on." By interpreting claims 14 and 28 in the broadest sense, claims 14 and 28 are anticipated by Yamazaki (US 2003/0027369 A1) and claims 30 and 32 are found obvious in view of Yamazaki (US 2003/0027369 A1) and further in view of Zucker et al. (USPN 6,218,682 B1) and Numata et al. (USPN 5,811,352). Therefore the rejection of claims 14, 28, 30, and 32 made in the previous Office action stands.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0027369 A1).

4. In reference to claims 14 and 28, Yamazaki (United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0027369 A1) discloses a similar device and its method of fabrication. Figures 4A-5C illustrate an active matrix organic electro luminescence display panel device with a low refractive film thin film (1109) on the substrate (1112). The examiner would like to note that the use of the word “on” by itself does not necessarily mean direct contact between two objects or layers in the semiconductor art. The word “on” by itself could mean that there may possibly be one or several layers between the two objects or layers to which the word “on” is referring. The applicant appears to interpret the word “on” in the same manner. The low refractive thin film (1109) is made of epoxy, a known low refractive film (see Hulse et al., USPN 6186,650 B1 - column 10, lines 52-53, Bhat et al., USPN 6,455,878 B1 – column 2, lines 61-64 and Camras et al., United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0027369 A1 – p. 7, paragraph 70). An organic electro luminescence diode (1105) is formed on

Art Unit: 2826

the low refractive thin film (1103) to selectively emit light. The switching device (1104c) or transistor, with a gate and an active layer, is formed between the low refractive film (1109) and the substrate (1112) in order to selectively drive the organic electro luminescence diode (1105). There is a first insulating layer formed between the substrate (1112) and the low refractive film (1109) to cover the switching device (1104c). The method of fabricating the device of figures 4A-5C meets the claimed method described in claim 28.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0027369 A1) in view of Zucker et al. (USPN 6,218,682 B1)

7. In reference to claims 30 and 32, Yamazaki does not disclose forming the insulating layer with silica gel. However silica gel is a known insulating material (Zucker et al. (USPN 6,218,682 B1, column 13, lines 16-18). The applicant is reminded in this regard that it has been held that mere selection of known materials generally understood to be suitable to make a device, the selection of the particular material being on the basis of suitability for the intended use, would be entirely obvious. In re Leshin

Art Unit: 2826

125 USPQ 416. Therefore claims 30 and 32 are not patentable over the Yamazaki reference.

8. Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0027369 A1) in view of Numata et al. (USPN 5,811,352).

9. In reference to claims 30 and 32, Yamazaki does not disclose forming the insulating layer with silica gel. However aerogel is a known insulating material (of Numata et al. (USPN 5,811,352, column 7, lines 40-41). The applicant is reminded in this regard that it has been held that mere selection of known materials generally understood to be suitable to make a device, the selection of the particular material being on the basis of suitability for the intended use, would be entirely obvious. In re Leshin 125 USPQ 416. Therefore claims 30 and 32 are not patentable over the Yamazaki reference.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 1-13, 15-27, and 33-36 were allowed in the previous Office action.

11. Claims 29 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the examiner is unaware of any prior art which suggests or renders obvious an active matrix organic electro luminescence display panel device with the explicit layer

structure with regard to the low refractive thin film directly on a substrate, the buffer layer and capacitor electrode as described the applicant.

### ***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Quinto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1920. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for


Art Unit: 2826

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KVQ

  
LEONARDO ANDUJAR  
PRIMARY EXAMINER